

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-17, and 19-36 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1 and 17 have been rejected. Claims 3-16, 19-32 have been objected to by the Examiner. Applicants note with appreciation that claims 33-36 have been indicated as allowable, as well as the comments regarding the amendments to claims 1 and 17.

Claims 1 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,025,818 ("Okano") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,310,588 (Kawahara et al., hereinafter "Kawahara").

In making the rejection of claims 1 and 17, the Examiner states,

The amendments to claims 1 and 17 merely include "a block of pixels of predetermined size having the current frame pixel inside the block of pixels". There is no mention of the requirement of a group of pixels in considering the previous fame [sic]. Further, the 'block of pixels' could be a block the size of a single pixel only including the current pixel. Therefore, the amendments to claims 1 and 17 do not overcome the previous rejections because Okano considers a block of pixels including the current frame pixel where the block is a single pixel in size.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 17 recite a "block of pixels", which means plural pixels, and should have been allowable as previously presented. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 17 to further indicate that the claimed "block of pixels" comprises a plurality of pixels, and added the recitation "for the current frame and the previous frame" to indicate that the block of pixels is used for calculating a difference between "each pixel in the current frame of the image signal and a pixel corresponding to the current frame pixel in a previous frame of the image signal using a block of pixels, comprising a

plurality of pixels, of predetermined size having the current frame pixel inside the block of pixels for the current frame and the previous frame" as recited in claim 1.

**Conclusion**

The Applicants have provided amendments to Claims 1 and 17. For the reasons stated by the Examiner, the claims are now distinguished from the cited prior art and, as a result, those claims are believed to be patentable in light thereof. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 17 under § 103(a).

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding these amendments or arguments, the Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the Applicant's attorney, listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: April 5, 2007

By:



Martin E. Miller  
Registration No. 56022

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620